Gender, Family and the Study of Welfare 'Regimes'

Lewis, Jane

DOI (link to publication from Publisher):
10.5278/freia.14136801

Publication date:
1995

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Jane Lewis

Gender, Family and the Study of Welfare 'Regimes'

FREIA

Paper
February 1995 **17**

Feminist Research Centre in Aalborg
Department of Development and Planning
Aalborg University
Fibigerstraede 2
DK-9220 Aalborg Ö.
Phone: +45 98-158522 Fax: +45 98-153298

Jane Lewis

Gender, Family and the Study of Welfare 'Regimes'

Jane Lewis:
Gender, Family and the Study of Welfare 'Regimes'

Paper from
FREIA - Feminist Research Centre in Aalborg
Department of Development and Planning
Aalborg University
Fibigerstraede 2
DK-9220 Aalborg Ö
Phone: +45 98 158522

Print: Kopicentralen, Aalborg University, 1995

Layout: Inger Jensen and Ellen Nyrup Pedersen

ISSN: 0907-2179

FREIA's paper series contains working papers, papers for conferences and seminars, project descriptions, lecture manuscripts, chapters from books etc. The papers are made by researchers affiliated to FREIA or by researchers who have visited the centre. The paper series aims at spreading the knowledge of FREIA's activities, internally as well as externally. Editors of the series are Ann-Dorte Christensen and Ruth Emerek. The papers can be ordered at Aalborg University, Department of Development and Planning, phone: +45 98 158522, ext. 2452.

Preface

The papers published in FREIA's paper series nos. 17 - 25 were all presented at the conference on **Gender Relations - State, Market, and Civil Society: The Nordic Experiences in a European Perspective**, arranged by FREIA - Feminist Research Centre in Aalborg, Aalborg University, August 14 - 18, 1993.

The idea of the conference was to examine the development of gender relations in Denmark/the Nordic countries in a comparative European perspective. In focus was the relationship between state, market and civil society/the family in the Nordic countries: the significance of this relationship to the development of gender relations - and in reverse, the influence of gender relations on the development of the Nordic welfare states. A comparative European approach was chosen for its usefulness in highlighting the specifities of the "Nordic model" regarding gender relations.

A primary purpose was to strenghten national and international cooperation on Ph.D. programmes in Social Science Gender Studies. The conference addressed Danish senior researchers within the Social Sciences. A few Ph.D.-students were invited as well as experts from other Nordic countries and international capacities within the field. The number of participants was 25. The conference was financed by the Danish Social Science Research Council.

The programme of the conference included four sessions:

I. Gender and the Labour Market
II. Gender, Welfare, and the Family
III. Gender, Power, and Democratic Citizenship
IV. Gender Theory and Feminist Research.

The full programme of the conference will be found at the end of this publication together with a list of the conference papers published elsewhere.

Ruth Emerek & Anna-Birte Ravn

Abstract

My paper will consider first why I think that a gendered approach to welfare and welfare regimes has merit, over and above a simple 'women and social policy' approach. Second, I want to signal the importance of considering the family in relation to the new-found emphasis on the mixed economy of welfare.

The second part of the paper will address the arguments about women's contribution to the making of welfare states. Much of this literature is American in origin and tends to argue that women as 'social maternalists' operating in the voluntary sector were crucial to the early production of welfare (the most recent example is Theda Skocpol's ***Protecting Soldiers and Mothers****, 1992). Drawing on material from the British case I wish to question the validity of the argument and suggest questions that must be asked for European countries.*

The third part of the paper will address the literature on welfare 'regimes'[1], in particular that of Gösta Esping Andersen. It suggests first, that gender cuts across his typology, and second, an alternative way of thinking about welfare regimes that begins from a consideration of unpaid as well as paid work in relation to welfare.

Finally, I would like to raise some questions that cross cut the analysis of both family and gender in relation to welfare regimes. These relate to our understanding of public and private in relation to social policies; how women have claimed within welfare states; and the possibilities of the state and of women's participation.

Introduction

A recent proposal for an international project on the building of European welfare states and the likely impact of '1992' sought to include a reference to gender:

> Gender represents an additional important frame of reference for investigating the development of a European Poverty Regime. "Gender homogeneity" (ie one standard male and female family role) is built into the structure of many European welfare states. Cross nationally, however, European welfare regimes vary dramatically in their modes of intervention in household formation and maintenance... These national regimes are incompatible; but without some family model, no Europeanization of policy against poverty (in 'households') is possible.[2]

There are many tensions here: first, gender is acknowledged as an important variable, but is still to be 'added on'; second, there is a tone of impatience regarding the need to disaggregate the family/household. This has never been done by social investigators studying the redistributive effects of social policies, notwithstanding the growing body of evidence, historical and contemporary, to show that resources passing through the front door of houses are not necessarily shared equally by occupants.

This passage also signals one of the major paradoxes of research on welfare and welfare states. While the rules concerning eligibility and entitlements are saturated with assumptions about family relationships, the family did not figure among the subjects of postwar welfare analysis. Until the advent of sustained feminist policy analysis in the mid-1970s[3], it was considered unproblematic that poverty surveys stopped at front doors, or that the campaign for de-institutionalisation (of the elderly and

the mentally ill) into 'the community'[4] made assumptions about the gendered division of caring work that were never explicitly acknowledged. The earliest, and still one of the major contributions of feminist social policy analysis was to trace the way in which assumptions regarding both the desirability and the existence of the male breadwinner/female carer two parent family form had been built into twentieth century social policies. Neither the family as a provider as well as consumer of welfare, nor the extent to which the bourgeois family form matched the reality, nor the different ways in which family members experienced social policies permeated mainstream policy analysis.

During the last decade, the comparison of the development of most welfare regimes has become a growth industry. Attention has focused on the causes of the development of social protection in late nineteenth and early twentieth developed countries, on the nature and reasons for the development of very different mechanisms and instruments for the delivery of welfare, and on outcomes in terms of redistribution. This literature has spilled over into citizenship debate about the nature of social rights, their historical development cross nationally and the possibility of their extension or contraction. The literature on comparative welfare regimes remains ungendered. In respect of citizenship, there is a strong feminist literature, but it remains entirely outside the mainstream debate.

This paper makes two main suggestions. First, that bringing the family back into the analysis of welfare regimes is crucial, in terms of understanding the dimensions of the mixed economy of welfare over time. If this is done, then the whole picture of the welfare state development begins to look more complicated than a simple linear progression from individualism to collectivism. Second, that gender as a variable is fundamental to the study of welfare regimes. When gender is integrated into policy analysis the typologies that have been developed

to understand the development of welfare regimes dissolve. In large part this is because the employment of gender as a variable for analysis makes clear the tensions between 'individual' and 'family' in the assumptions behind social policies. Finally, consideration of gender makes the measures of outcome that are currently used look woefully inadequate.

The Mixed Economy of Welfare

The most innovative analysis of social policy in the post-war period failed to consider the role of either the family or the voluntary sector. Richard Titmuss's extremely important framework for understanding the dimensions of welfare included only occupational provision and fiscal policy, in addition to state services and transfers.[5] In large measure the omission of the family, which has arguably always been the biggest provider of welfare, and voluntary organisations stemmed from the way in which the history of the British welfare state had developed. Standard accounts emphasised the movement away from the diagnosis of poverty as an individual problem susceptible to individual solution, either at the hands of charity (in the case of the deserving) or the poor law (in the case of the undeserving) towards collective provision based on citizen right.[6] Explanation was directed towards the apparent shift from individualism to collectivism. The family and the voluntary sector have been 'rediscovered' as providers of welfare during the 1980s, chiefly by New Right governments.

This model of explanation with its particular blindspots is surprising for two reason, first, any effort at comparative work (singularly missing from the early history of welfare states) would have immediately signalled the more complicated mixed economies of welfare operating in other European countries, where voluntary organisations and churches often acted as important mediating institutions. As Paci has commented,

what is interesting is how and why the welfare mix has varied over time in different countries.[7] Second, any closer analysis of the writings of those involved in social action in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries would have revealed that the debate was not so much set in the dichotomous terms of individualism versus collectivism, but in terms of the relationship between the individual, the family and the state. My illustration of this point has unfortunately to be confined to the British case which provides my only primary source material. The illustration discusses the ideas of mainstream social theorists and activists about social problems, social provision and social change during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the period during which major developments in state provisions, such as workmen's compensation, old age pensions and national insurance were being discussed, and in some countries legislated.

I want to suggest that so-called nineteenth century 'individualism' was a lot more complicated than a simple belief in self-interest and self help. It offered a model of social change that relied on holistic social work by middle class female volunteers with individuals in their family context, and it was undertaken with the aim of producing fully participative citizens. As such, it could even coexist with a measure of commitment to state collectivism. The commitment to individualism was above all to a method of practice. The focus was the individual and the family as both the agent and object of welfare. It is in part because the history of the development of ideas about social action and its practice have been distorted that the response to the renewed emphasis on a mixed economy of welfare, with particular stress on the informal sector, has been muted.

Social theory and social action were intimately linked in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in a way that has since become alien. Those social thinkers who also played a major role in late

nineteenth and early twentieth century charity and occupied an influential place as advisors to government were inclined to see individualism and collectivism as positions on a spectrum rather than as dichotomies. The turn of the century debate about the role of the state was not really a straightforward battle between the state's 'friends' and 'enemies.[8] As Stefan Colloni has observed, there existed a hegemonic set of assumptions regarding 'the idea of service, the duty to contribute to the common good, the need to make the best of oneself, the duty of self development and so on'.[9] People like Helen and Bernard Bosanquet, both pillars of the Charity Organisation Society, rejected the idea of 'atomic individualism' that underpinned the idea of self help, and argued instead for an ethical or 'higher individualism'.[10] This involved the development of a more complete human nature, part of which required individuals to fulfil their obligations to their fellowmen.

In this view, individual character was held to be most important determinant of the individual's circumstances, but this did not entail attributing all blame to individuals and thereby leaving them to their fate: 'A moral point of view does not mean a point of view which holds a question as solved by apportioning blame to the unfortunate: it does mean a point of view which treats men not as economic abstractions, but as living selves with a history and ideas and a character of their own'.[11] In terms of seeking a practical solution to poverty, such a view emphasized above all the restorative power of character. To improve character would effect much more fundamental improvement than changing economic conditions, which could result in change for the better only if character also improved. It followed that no misfortune, no matter how distressing, was irredeemable until the individual's will was broken. It became the task of the (female) social worker to repair will and build character.

The family occupied a special place in these arguments regarding the importance of human motivation and character. In the mainstream of late nineteenth century thought, social awareness was built up through the family. Above all, the family was the primary institution in which character was developed and rational citizens were produced. In Helen Bosanquet's influential book **The Family** (1906), she argued that the Family (always capitalized) was the fundamental social unit. Its importance lay in the part it played in stimulating the interests of the individual. Natural affection between husband and wife and between parent and child, ensured that homes became 'nurseries of citizenship'.[12] The family was thus seen as the ethical root of a higher ethical state, a microcosm of the polis.

In **The Family**, Helen Bosanquet argued that the natural interest of family members in each other's welfare was a more powerful tie binding families together than economic considerations, patriarchal power or primitive maternal instinct. Through the altruistic love that naturally characterized family relationship, individuals achieved consciousness of their unity with others. The family stood as a 'half-way house', mediating between the individual and the community.[13] A strong citizenry and a strong state depended on the strengthening of the bonds between the individual and the family, and between the family and the wider community.[14]

In a manner not unlike that of the 1950s structural functionalists[15], the family was seen to play the crucial role in socializing the individual. Helen Bosanquet drew heavily on the work of the French sociologist, Frederick Le Play, who argued that 'good' family organisation was an essential factor contributing to the prosperity and contentment of a people. Where family members developed their sense of responsibility one to the other, Helen Bosanquet argued, 'the Family presented itself as the medium by which the public interest is combined with private

welfare'. In this analysis, social problems disappeared when the family was strong and effective. For example, old age pensions were unnecessary 'where the stable Family combines young and old in one strong bond of mutual helpfulness'.[16] The hallmark of the disreputable poor was lack of family feeling and a failure to socialize the young into 'habits of labour and obedience'.

In many respects, this analysis was superficially similar to that of Herbert Spencer, who viewed the family as the seat of altruism, care and protection, while the public sphere was characterized by ruthless competition.[17] However, in the view of social activists, public and private were less mutually exclusive. Helen Bosanquet listed the family's responsibilities as looking after people, sending them out to work, and taking responsibility for ruling small communities beyond the family, in local government for example. The struggle for existence was in this view a struggle for a place in the community, to be won not on social Darwinist principles, but by those who were prepared to cooperate. And cooperation was developed by virtue of family membership.[18]

In this analysis it was difficult to offer aid to the family without damaging its responsibility and subverting character. Achieving social change by changing individual will was necessarily a slow business. Successful change could only come when the individual was ready for it. It was therefore unlikely that as crude an agent as the state could be effective in securing it. Thus at the level of policy prescription, a barrier was erected between family and state. But this was not absolute in the manner of Spencer, or of 1980s New Right thinkers, like Ferdinand Mount, for example, who has stated his hostility to all professional entry into the home.[19] Turn of the century social activists aimed to use trained volunteer social workers to educate family members, strengthen character and thus deepen the ties of obligation within the community. Bernard Bosanquet referred to the need for 'an army of social healers', ready

to supervise family life.[20] Social workers worked with members of families to enable them to regain 'self-maintenance', which was in turn necessary for them to become fully participative citizens.

This dominant model of social theory and social action has been labelled 'individualism' in the sense of anti-collectivism. But in fact this sort individualism encompassed a method as well as a vehicle for treating the poor. Early twentieth century voluntary organisations like the Personal Service Association and the Guilds of Help were prepared to invoke a new 'partnership' with the state, but they retained their faith in social work with individuals and families as the solution to social problems. This is not to deny that in practice middle class women social workers often sought to impose middle class norms on poor families and in particular the gendered obligations of breadwinning for men and household management for women associated with a 'stable' family. But the primary aim was always the achievement of participative citizenship; in the case of Helen Bosanquet, she combined her zeal for social work with support for votes for women, which she felt would be particularly important to working class women's capacity for self-realization.

If the important place accorded the family in earlier debates about the development of social provision is ignored, the history of that development becomes dangerously distorted. The debate has never been, and is not today, simply about individualism in the sense of self help or collectivism. The role of mediating institutions, of which the family has been the most important, are crucial to understanding the complexity of welfare relationship. Furthermore, by passing over the kind of ideas I have outlined here in the rush to welcome the post-war social settlement, the significance of the emphasis on individual development within the family as a means to social participation was also lost, with

the result that material well-being became the sole goal of the welfare state and the sole measure of success.

The Development of State Welfare

Arguably, linear accounts of welfare state development - out of the darkness of the poor law and charity, into the light of Beveridge - that bypass both the family and voluntary sector as providers of welfare have tended to obscure women's role in the building of modern welfare regimes. Certainly the mainstream literature on the subject addresses economic, institutional, political and class variables but pays little attention to gender. The older functionalist arguments which viewed the emergence of social policies as part of the logic of industrialisation do go some way towards suggesting why modern states took steps to rehabilitate the injured, facilitate labour mobility and protect skilled (male) workers against sickness and unemployment.[21] Many more recent left-of-centre writers on the emergence of welfare states have also stressed the degree to which the survival of capitalism requires a degree of social protection.[22]

But the timing and instruments of social protection differed widely between nation states. Explanations of this variation have focused much more on actors and politics, with the arguments falling into two broad camps: either that social provision has been imposed 'from above' or extracted by working people 'from below'. Theda Skocpol made a forceful attempt to bring the state back in and to argue for the importance of states and bureaucracies as autonomous actors.[23] But the majority of participants in the debate focus on the importance of social class. Piven and Cloward, for example, have argued that elites made concessions to the poor to prevent, or in response to, social unrest, but that gains were substantially weakened when peace was restored. The

social democratic 'power resources' model, emanating from Sweden, has argued for the importance of working class strength and the way in which wage earners were able to use the democratic state to displace class struggles from the workplace into the political arena.[24] More recent work has emphasised the importance of alliances between the working and middle classes in the creation of 'solidaristic' welfare states that offer universal, tax based provision.[25]

Recent, mainly American, attempts to look at women's role in developing welfare states has stressed the extent of women's social welfare activity based on 'social maternalist politics'. Sklar has argued that this was so important in the United States that 'gender did the work of class in shaping the welfare state'.[26] Koven and Michel have suggested that in the weakly centralised late nineteenth century states of Britain and the USA, women were able to exert considerable influence through their philanthropic work, which they compare favourably to women's lack of power in late twentieth century institutional, universal welfare states such as Sweden.[27] Not only is this hard to prove - the field of influence measured by the amount of legislative change secured by even famous women philanthropists remained small, - but in terms of outcome the vast majority of nineteenth century British and North American women remained poor, and, because philanthropic effort was patchy, such benefits as they acquired were unevenly distributed. Koven and Michel also suggest that women in the USA and Britain used their authority as experts in maternal and child welfare to build powerful women's movements which in turn helped them to forge political identities. This is an overgeneralisation. In fact suffrage effectively split the female world of philanthropy when it came to national party politics. In accounts such as that of Koven and Michel, it becomes all too easy to elide local and national politics. Crucially in turn of the century Britain, social policies were matters of local government jurisdiction and finance. Virtually all women social activists including leading anti-suffragists, supported female

participation in local government, but national politics were conceived of primarily as imperial and foreign politics and therefore as men's sphere. Women may have done much to 'domesticate' social administration locally,[28] but one of the problems after 1900 was that social policy issues were becoming matters of high politics. There is no real evidence to suggest that women crossed this divide in significant numbers and therefore that they influenced the development of state welfare provision.

Indeed, there is a reasonable amount of evidence to the contrary. As social work and health visiting became professionalised, so women lost control of their training and regulation. In addition, with the firm separation of social theory and social action, individual social work was no longer viewed as integral to the process of achieving social change, but rather became a residual activity concerned with 'problem families', the mid-twentieth century equivalent of the late nineteenth century residuum or undeserving poor. Benefits delivered 'as of right' would meet the needs of the majority. Women did not penetrate the administrative echelons of the civil service. This was reserved to men, who made their way, like Beveridge, from the settlements houses to policymaking. Nor did women hold significant national political power in any mid-twentieth century welfare state.

The results of this political and administrative weakness is clearly demonstrated in the fate of feminist arguments for family allowances between 1918 and 1944 in Britain.[29] Feminists conceived of allowances as a way first, of rewarding women's unpaid caring work. In the initial (1918) proposal an allowance for the mother was included as well as for children. The proposal was thus grounded - unexceptionally in the context of women's welfare work on behalf of mothers and children - in difference. But more radically, it also sought to achieve equality in wages. If women and children were receiving a social wage, male workers would no longer be able to bargain a family wage. As Susan

Pedersen has traced, the claim was defeated by the power of three oppositional discourses, first, social scientists arguing that women could not be said to have dependants; second, labour party men and male trade unionists who argued for the family wage to keep up male wage, often revealing in the process the way in which the responsibility for maintaining a family was perceived as an emblem of masculinity; and third, civil servants who denied that the support of motherhood should be the direct concern of government. The eventual 1944 legislation was designed primarily to keep down wage-push inflation. Thus, given the weak political base of feminist reformers, the potentially radical nature of their proposal made it impossible for them to achieve.

Late nineteenth century women's influence in the voluntary sector, primarily as visitors or social workers with the poor, may legitimately be seen as important in the development of social provision (in Britain after all six times as much money flowed through the voluntary sector as through the poor law), but this work did not mean that women became policymakers or even administrators in twentieth century state welfare. Nevertheless, it is possible to argue that women's early welfare work did influence the nature of later state provision. Women became identified with a specific form of intervention that made them the individuals in families who were to become both the agents and the objects of social reform.[30] The attention of the female social worker inevitably focused more steadily on the working class wife than on the working class husband. It was possible both to look on her with more sympathy and to exercise more authority over her. Above all, whether as agents or objects of social intervention, it was women's role as wives and mothers that was invoked. The belief that pressing social problems, for example, juvenile delinquency, could be solved by better mothering, enjoyed a life long beyond the desire of philanthropic women to promote the fulfilment of family responsibilities and, in particular, was reinforced by mid-twentieth century professional and academic psychologists. It

was also as wives and mothers that women became part of the new state provisions to secure income maintenance.

Welfare Regimes and the Gendered Basis of Entitlements

In the comparative literature on welfare regimes, gender tends only to enter the picture when the numbers of women in the labour force become significant.[31] This is of course a function of the linkage between economic activity and welfare provision. To explicitly recognise this linkage is an advance; the post-war literature on welfare states tended to be confined to the politics of redistribution.[32] It is also the case that because welfare provision in modern welfare states tends to be dominated by mechanisms for income maintenance, the relationship under microscope is that of the wage earner to the labour market. Most comparative studies use data on social security systems to provide the core of the analysis.

However, this focus misses the problem that is central both to the production of welfare and to the position of women: the relationship between unpaid caring work for children and dependent adults in the family, and paid work. In the broadest terms, making gender a central variable in the analysis of welfare regimes also forces a redefinition of work.[33] In particular, it will be suggested here that the strength of the family wage model may have potential as a predictor of women's position in welfare regimes.

Welfare states developed different structures which have had very different implications for women. Many typologies of these structures have been developed. The earliest used only public expenditure measures, without due regard either for the numbers in need and therefore the amount of welfare effort needed, or how the money was spent (for example, in Austria civil servants have historically gained the best

benefits). The literature is dominated by historical sociologists and political scientists, although most contributors recognise the importance of an historical perspective. For example, Castles has written of the 'suspicion that we may frequently be asking the wrong questions' and of the importance of 'moving beyond the selfimposed methodological constraints of an exclusively quantitative methodology'. 'History', he concludes, 'reveals the one sense in which it is meaningful to say that the sum is more than its parts: the sense in which human action is embedded in its particular context'.[34] But it is very hard to combine primary and secondary source materials in comparative historical analysis.[35] Indeed, because they are drawn from secondary sources, the illustrations in this section work at a quite different level from those in the previous section.

The most recent influential typology developed by Esping Andersen is based on a comparison of social rights, defined as the extent to which people are permitted to make their living standards independent of market forces (decommodification). Decommodified rights have been differentially developed in welfare states. The Scandinavian (social democratic) countries and, to some extent, Britain emerged from World War II with a commitment to universally provided benefits and services, based on citizen right, and full employment. The conservative/Catholic countries of Austria, Belgium, France and Germany emerged with a commitment to making the state a compensator of first resort through social insurance programmes organised so as to maintain status differentials between occupational groups and between men as breadwinners and women as wives and mothers. The principle of 'subsidiarity' also operated to ensure that the state only intervened to provide services when family resources were used up. The USA, to some extent Canada and Australia, and, by the end of the 1980's, Britain developed 'liberal' welfare regimes, characterized by means-tested benefits and a residual role for the state. These groupings of welfare

regimes are both loose and disputed; Australia, for example, is certainly a low welfare spender and operates a variety of tough means tests, but it has had a long-standing commitment (since the 1900s) to wages-as-welfare, with centralized wage-bargaining machinery that is more reminiscent of Sweden than anywhere else.[36] Within the liberal welfare regime category, only the USA is a truly committed residual welfare state in terms of both transfer payments and services; even post-Mrs. Thatcher a tax-financed national health service continues to exist in Britain. On the other hand, it would be quite wrong to dismiss the USA as having no welfare state; social insurance programmes for old age pensions and medical care are huge and grew significantly in size even during the 1980s.[37]

Gender regimes tend to cut right across this kind of typology. This is because of women's relationship to paid and unpaid work and their complicated statuses of dependant and (independent) wage earner over the life course. The major commitment of both conservative and liberal welfare regimes in the twentieth and liberal welfare regimes in the twentieth century has been to the development of insurance schemes which work via the labour market. Core welfare programmes have thus been above all the prerogative of the regularly employed, who have been predominantly male. In most welfare systems, women's rights to welfare have therefore been indirect, a function of their assumed dependence on a male breadwinner. The idea of female dependants underpinned the emergence of a male breadwinner/female and child dependants model in most industrial countries, although its strength varied considerably, from the very strong in the US, Britain, Germany and the Netherlands (a group of countries that includes high, medium and low welfare spenders), to the more complicated mixed models, such as that of France, which acknowledged women as both citizen reproducers (mothers) and citizen producers (workers),[38] and finally to post-1970 Sweden, which treats both men and women as citizen producers for the purposes of

welfare entitlements. Strong family breadwinner models also tend to operate insurance/assistance systems, whereby first class (insurance) benefits tend to go to the regularly employed men and second class assistance (welfare) benefits to women. This is true of the Netherlands, Britain and the USA. In Germany, where a social insurance model predominates, the system works to ensure what Langan and Ostner have called 'a gendered status maintenance' model, which subsidises female exit from, or non-entry to, the labour market and thus preserves traditional gender roles.[39] In Britain and the Netherlands, women had no entitlement to any insurance benefits in their own right until the 1970s and 1980s respectively. In addition, the expansion of women's labour market participation has tended to be part-time. This is particularly true of Britain and the Netherlands, where virtually the whole increase in married women's employment since the 1960s is accounted for in terms of part-time work. In these countries the social insurance rules concerning eligibility for benefit, which have discriminated against married women have also impacted on their labour market participation.

The result of the family wage model has been three fold, first women's paid work has been regarded as secondary and has been concomitantly ill-paid, second, women's substantial contributions to welfare, paid and unpaid, have been ignored and with them the direct entitlements that should have been their due, and third, women's needs have been defined in terms of motherhood as a social function rather than on the basis of individual need.[40] In fact, while potential or actual motherhood has provided the justification for making the grounds of women's social entitlement different from that of men, it has been (necessarily) as wives rather than as mothers that women have qualified for benefits in most state social security systems. However, it is noteworthy that in strong family breadwinner models of social provision, protective labour legislation has also tended to be strong; as Mary Poovey has pointed out, protection is the other side of the coin from dependency.[41] France

never saw the campaigns against married women's work that happened in Britain, but also did not oppose legislated maternity leave as also happened in Britain.

In principle, women do better the more institutional and universal the welfare system, that is the more it is based on citizen right. In Esping Andersen's typology this is the Scandinavian, social democratic model. Yet as Arnlaug Leira has shown, the idea of a Scandinavian welfare regime also disappears as soon as gender is introduced as a variable. The Norwegian model, which treats women primarily as wives and mothers is closer in many respects to that of Britain or the Netherlands than it is to Sweden. Sweden is unusual in that since the late 1960s government took a number of decisive steps that transformed the basis of women's social entitlements, from that of wife and mother to that of paid worker. The key pieces of legislation which arguably were legitimated by the feminist demands, owed more to the need for female labour, given that the powerful trade union movement took a stand against immigration.[42] The active use of labour market and family policies to promote a significant change in women's position was not in and of itself out of line with the broader pattern of development of the Swedish welfare state, which prioritised full employment and also demanded that those qualifying for its most generous benefits manifest their readiness to work. The first change came in 1971 with the introduction of separate tax, which given high marginal tax rates meant that it was generally more favourable for family income if a woman went out to work rather than the man adding extra over-time hours. The second major change was the rapid increase in public day care provision from 10% of under-school age children in 1968 to 47% in 1987 and the third, parental insurance, set at six months leave at 90% replacement income in 1974 and extended to 12 months in 1980. As a result, the labour participation rate of Swedish women aged 25-54 is only 5% less than that for men of comparable ages and the housewife is virtually

extinct. Large numbers of women work part-time, but this has a quite different meaning from part-time work in strong family wage-influenced countries. Most Swedish women are actually in full-time jobs (with full-time benefit rights) but are exercising their right to work three-quarters time while their children are under eight. In recent decades the Swedish model has therefore treated women, as well as men, as breadwinners, but has arguably grafted on claims based on women's 'difference' as mothers.

The fact remains that nowhere has any welfare system managed to attach a significant value directly to the unpaid work of caring that women do for the young and old within the family. The definition of social citizenship entitlements in institutional, universal welfare states is as much as anywhere else linked firmly to the independent status of wage earner.[43] Swedish women get the best rewards for this sort of work, but by virtue of first making themselves workers and then claiming the right to income maintenance. Gender regimes make dichotomous choices as to whether to treat women as citizen mothers or citizen workers.

This becomes even more clear cut if we pursue the treatment of what Mary Poovey would term a 'border case',[44] women with children and without men. Historically, most welfare states have experienced considerable difficulty in deciding whether to treat lone mothers as 'mothers' or 'workers'. In late nineteenth century Britain under the poor law it was not uncommon for widows, the most numerous group and perceived as the most deserving, to be told to work and support one or two children with some aid from outdoor relief, while the rest were taken into the workhouse.[45] By the early part of the century, the US example was attracting British attention. Many states had begun to pay 'mothers' pensions. These, in the form of widows pensions, were not introduced in Britain until 1925 and it was not until after WWII, during the heyday of ideas about maternal deprivation and the importance of

constant maternal care, that some consensus was achieved about the desirability of mothers staying at home. Some strong family wage-influenced welfare regimes still tend to treat lone mothers as mothers. Thus in Britain and the Netherlands the labour participation of lone mothers is very low. But in the USA and Germany it is higher than for married women; indeed in the USA during the 1980s the pendulum has swung back to the nineteenth century model of treating lone mothers as workers (on equal terms to men) using workfare schemes. In Sweden, of course, 85% of lone mothers are in the labour market under a model which treats all men and women as workers. The point is, that if the importance of family wage models are granted in the structuring of welfare regimes, then unpredictability regarding the treatment of lone mothers logically follows.

Welfare Regimes and Gendered Outcomes

Analysis of the redistributive effects of welfare systems has been conducted using social class as the main variable and has crucially, from the point of view of gender distribution, stopped outside the front door of the household. Given married and cohabiting women's lack of fully individualised rights to claim in the majority of social security systems, it is impossible to know how they fare without a thorough analysis of the distribution of resources within the household. Early social investigators spotted the importance of this point when they recorded that women often did not know what their husbands earned, or when they began to study family budgets, which revealed the unequal division of spending money, food and clothing.[46] But only recently has a large body of evidence been accumulated on such household divisions[47] and this has met resistance from policymakers anxious not to individualize the treatment of men and women, both for reasons of cost and for fear of the implications for marriage as the proper site for sexual relations

(disaggregation would mean the end of the 'cohabitation rule', for example).

During the 1980s, attention has been drawn by American writers to 'the feminisation of poverty'.[48] In fact, the feminisation of poverty is not new,[49] British data show roughly the same proportion of claimants under the poor law in 1908 and under income support in 1987 as female. Paradoxically, it is possible to argue that while women are poorer, they have nonetheless done better out of welfare states because their claims are more numerous. This is also true of welfare services. Women are likely to have benefitted disproportionately from health services and from publicly provided caring services for the elderly and for children. In reaching some assessment of welfare benefits, it is therefore important to broaden the measures used to include services as well as income transfers. The contraction of the social wage during the 1980s in countries with New Right governments has had welfare implications that are heavily gendered.

It is also necessary to include measures of time as well as money. Because women bear primary responsibility for unpaid work, extension of their paid labour often means that they become increasingly time-poor. In the case of lone mothers in Sweden, for example, their labour market position makes their living standards among the best Europe, but they are much more time poor than British lone mothers. Time poverty militates against social and political participation, which, while it has been lost sight of as a goal of post-war welfare states, is of crucial importance in getting claims onto political agendas. Arguably, measures underpinning welfare audits require more radical extension if gender is considered as a variable. Freedom from fear of public or private violence is one such addition. While both the political Right and Left agree on the importance of the right not to be interfered with and whereas

the enabling right to welfare is highly contentious, women have a long way to go in exercising their negative rights.

Conclusion: Issues in the Study of Welfare Regimes

I fancy that the relationship between gender and family in the analysis of welfare regimes is being conceptualised somewhat differently from other fields. Feminist analysis of the late 1960s and early 1970s found it easy to make links between the family as a source of female oppression and social policies which buttressed the bourgeois family form; Elizabeth Wilson, for example argued that 'social welfare policies amounted to no less than the state organisation of domestic life'.[50] The idea that assumptions about family form and function obscured the need of individual family members was powerful, and, as I have suggested could be taken further as the basis for the construction of a new typology of welfare regimes. But study of the family as a mediating structure in the provision of the welfare has nevertheless been strangely absent from analysis.

A number of these cross cut the analysis of both family and gender in relation to welfare regimes and I would like briefly to delineate these as possible further points for discussion:

1. Public and Private: Most mainstream literature on welfare treats this dichotomy in the sense of collective versus market provision, but the place of the informal provision of welfare over time merits further investigation. Within feminist literature this has begged the question of how far women have chosen to do unpaid caring work: whether they have defended personal territory from intrusion and whether there have been fundamentally different values pertaining to caring work which women have fought to keep separate from the market.[51] In a rather

different vein, Land and Rose have argued that for there to be a choice to care, there must be a choice not to care, which throws the focus for research firmly back onto the nature of the welfare mix.[52]

2. How women have claimed within welfare states: Claims to state welfare have been granted usually on the basis of 'difference', that is, to women as citizen mothers. But late twentieth century New Right governments have increasingly swung towards treating women as equal to, in the sense of on-the-same-terms-as, men. Thus 1980s workfare (in the USA) and divorce legislation (in Britain and the US) treat men and women the same. The terms on which women's claims have been entertained and how women themselves have claimed, for example British feminists' campaign for family allowances, which attempted to transcend the equality/difference dichotomy (see above, p. 12), are important. As Nancy Fraser has pointed out, when feminists 'speak publicly of heretofore depoliticized needs, they contest established boundaries separating 'politics' from 'economics' and 'domestics', which also means that they will usually provoke substantial opposition'.[53]

3. The possibilities of the state: English speaking feminist literature has tended to a pessimistic interpretation of the welfare state as 'state patriarchy', albeit that there is now a greater measure of consensus that welfare states have changed the structure of male power as well as reinforcing it. Also, there is substantial recognition that patriarchy at one remove (from an individual husband, brother, uncle) might be preferable. If it is accepted that there are three major sources of income for women in welfare states - men, the labour market and the state - then the twentieth century has seen a major shift towards increasing dependency on the labour market for married women and single women without children and away from husbands, while for single women with children the shift has been away from dependence on a male relative and towards greater dependence on the state and wages.

Scandinavian feminists are much more optimistic about the possibility of 'a woman-friendly state'.[54] The difference in perception relates both to the different degree of material gains women have made and to the different degree of political participation achieved by women in the Scandinavian countries. Many feminist political theorists are currently arguing strongly for 'participation from below' and for the representation of 'differences'. Iris Young for example, has argued first, that the idea of universal citizenship has in practice excluded groups judged not capable of adopting the general point of view, and second, that the existence of privileged groups has meant that the equal treatment inherent in the idea of universality has perpetuated inequality.[55] She has therefore advocated that full participation by all requires mechanisms for group representation. However, by beginning with the construction of ways to represent differences, Young begs the question of how the problem of differential power and hierarchy between interest groups is to be overcome. I would suggest that before we jump we need more systematic empirical investigation of the gender balance existing under different welfare regimes. The Swedish system represents the antithesis of Young's vision and yet arguably, for all its problems, has delivered most to women.

Notes

1. The term is used by Gösta Esping Andersen in his **The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism** (Cambridge: Polity, 1990) and is used to denote the linkage between economic acticvity and welfare provision. I use it in preference to the term 'welfare state'.

2. S. Liebfreid and P. Pierson, 'Building the Welfare State. The Development of Poverty Regimes in the USA and "the USE"', TS, 1990, p. 8.

3. Especially E. Wilson, **Women and the Welfare State** (London: Tavistock, 1977).

4. For a summary consideration, see my '"It all Really Starts in the Family..."Community Care in the 1980s', **Journal of Law and Society** 16 (1989): 83-96.

5. Richard Titmuss, 'The Social Division of Welfare', in **Essays on the Welfare State** (London: Allen and Unwin, 1963).

6. This was primarily the line taken by accounts of social policy development, eg T.H. Marshall, **Class, Citizenship and Social Development** (London: Heinemann, 1963).

7. M. Paci, 'Long Waves in the Development of Welfare Systems', in Charles S. Maier (ed.), **Boundaries of the Political** (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 179-99.

8. Eg., Rodney Barker, **Political Ideas in Modern Britain** (London: Methuen, 1978).

9. Stefan Collini, **Liberalism and Sociology** (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

10. Andrew Vincent and Raymond Plant, **Philosophy, Politics and Citizenship** (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984).

11. Bernard Bosanquet, 'Character in its Bearing on Social Causation', in B. Bosanquet (ed.), **Aspects of Social Reform** (London: Macmillan, 1895), p. 105.

12. Bernard Bosanquet, 'The Duties of Citizenship', in Bosanquet, **Aspects**, p. 10.

13. Helen Bosanquet, **The Family** (London: Macmillan, 1906), pp. 204-6.

14. Bernard Bosanquet, **The Philosophical Theory of the State** (London: Macmillan, 1899), p. 300.

15. T. Parsons and R.F. Bales, **Family Socialization and Interaction Process** (Glencoe Ill.: Free Press, 1955).

16. H. Bosanquet, **Family,** pp. 95 and 99.

17. Herbert Spencer, **Man Versus the State** (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969), first ed. 1884.

18. H. Bosanquet, **Family**, p. 99; Bolsanquet, 'Socialism and Natural Selection', in B. Bosanquet (ed.), **Aspects,** p. 299.

19. Ferdinand Mount, **The Subversive Family** (London: Allen and Unwin, 1983).

20. B. Bosanquet, 'I - The Majority Report [on the Poor Laws]'. **Sociological Review 2** (1909), p. 115.

21. H. Wilensky and C.N. Lebaux, **Industrial Society and Social Welfare** (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958).

22. Eg., G. Esping Andersen, 'The Comparison of Policy Regimes: an Introduction', in M. Rein, G. Esping Andersen and L. Rainwater, **Stagnation and Renewal in Social Policy** (New York: M. E. Sharpe Inc, 1987), pp. 3-12.

23. Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschmeyer and Theda Skocpol (eds.), **Bringing the State Back in** (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

24. Frances Fox Piven and Richard A Cloward, **Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare** (New York: Pantheon Books, 1971). W. Korpi, **The Working Class in Welfare Capitalism: Work, Unions and Politics in Sweden** (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978).

25. Peter Baldwin, **The Politics of Social Solidarity. Class Bases of the European Welfare State. 1875-1975** (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

26. Cited in Seth Koven and Sonya Michel, 'Womanly Duties: Maternalist Politics and the Emergence of Welfare States in France, Germany, Great Britain and the USA, 1880-1920', **AHR** (1990).

27. Ibid.

28. Paula Baker, 'The Domestication of Politics. Women in American Political Society, 1780-1920', **AHR** 89 (1984); and P. Hollis, **Ladies Elect** (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986).

29. John Macnicold, **The English Movement for Family Allowances** (London: Heinemann, 1980); and J. Lewis, **The Politics of Motherhood** (London: Croom Helm, 1980) give background on this, but what follows draws mainly on Susan Pedersen, 'The Failure of Feminism in the Making of the British Welfare State', **Radical History Review** 43 (1989): 86-110.

30. Denise Riley, **Am I that Name?** (London: Macmillan, 1989) makes this point.

31. This is true of Esping Andersen's **Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism**, for example.

32. This produced a neo-marxist revisionist literature during the 1970s focusing instead on the politics and relations of production, see for example, I. Gough, **The Political Economy of the Welfare State** (London: Macmillan, 1979). M. Bulmer, J. Lewis and D. Piachaud (eds.), **The Goals of Social Policy** (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989) discusses these developments.

33. David Piachaud, 'The Distribution of income and Work', **Oxford Review of Economic Policy** 3, No 3 (1989).

34. Francis Castles (ed.), **The Comparative History of Public Policy** (Cambridge: Polity, 1989), pp. 7 and 9.

35. For example, Peter Baldwin, **The Politics of Social Solidatity** (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), which while excellent almost gets bogged down in the primary level material. Dan Fox, **Health Policies and Health Politics. The British and American Experience, 1911-65**

(Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986) is a good example of a total mismatch between the two levels of data.

36. F. Castles and D. Mitchell. 'A Radical World of Welfare? The Welfare State and Equality in the English Speaking Family of Nations', unpub. paper, ANU, 1991.

37. Theodore Marmor, **America's Misunderstood Welfare State** (New York: Basic Books, 1990).

38. Jane Jenson, 'Gender and Reproduction, or, Babies and the State', **Studies in Canadian Political Economy** 20 (1986).

39. M. Langan and I. Ostner, 'Gender and Welfare. Towards a Comparative Framework', in Graham Room (ed)., **European Developments in Social Policy (forthcoming).**

40. Hilary Land, 'Who Cares for the Family?' **Journal of Social Policy** 7 (1978): 257-84; and Denise Riley, 'The Free Mothers: Pronatalism and Women Workers in Industry at the End of the Last World War in Britain', **History Workshop Journal** No. 11 (1981): 59-118.

41. Mary Poovey, **Uneven Developments** (London: Virago, 1989).

42. Thomas Hammar, **European Immigration Policy** (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1985).

43. Carole Pateman, 'The Patriarchal Welfare State', in Amy Gutman (ed.), **Democracy and the Welfare State** (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), pp. 231-60.

44. Poovey, **Uneven Developments.**

45. Pat Thane, 'Women and the Poor Law in Victorian and Edwardian England', **History Workshop Journal** No. 6 (1978): 29-51.

46. Eg., M.S. Pember Reeves, **Round About a Pound a Week** (London: Bell and Sons, 1915).

47. Eg., Jan Pahl, **Money and Marriage** (London: Macmillan, 1989); Julia Brannen and Gail Wilson (eds.), **Give and Take in Families** (London: Allen and Unwin, 1987).

48. See the contributions in Linda Gordon (ed.), **Women, Welfare and the State** (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990).

49. See J. Lewis and D. Piachaud, 'Women and Poverty in Twentieth Century Britian', in Jane Millar and Caroline Glendinning (eds.), **Women and Poverty in Britain** (Brighton: Wheatsheaf, 1986).

50. Wilson, **Women and the Welfare State.**

51. See Carol Gilligan, **In a Different Voice** (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), and Jean Bekte Elshtain, **Public Man and Private Woman** (Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1981).

52. Hilary Land and Hilary Rose, 'Compulsory Altruism for Some or an Altruistic Society for All', in P. Bean et.al. (eds.), **In Defence of Welfare** (London: Tavistock, 1985), pp. 74-96.

53. Nancy Fraser, 'Talking about Needs: Interpretive Contests as Political Conflicts in Welfare State Societies', **Ethics** 99 (1989).

54. Eg., Helga Hernes, **Welfare States and Woman Power** (Oslo: Norwegian University Press, 1987).

55. Iris Marion Young, 'Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship', **Ethics** 99 (1989).

Programme

Gender Relations - State, Market, and Civil Society The Nordic Experiences in a European Perspective

Aalborg University, Fibigerstræde 2
August 14 - 18, 1993

Programme Committee:
Ruth Emerek, Ulla Koch, Anna-Birte Ravn, and Birte Siim

Sunday, August 15

9.00 - 10.00 a.m. **Registration and coffee**
10.00 - 10.30 a.m. **Introduction and presentation**
10.30 - 12.30 a.m. **Sylvia Walby**: *Different Forms of Patriarchy: European Comparisons*

12.30 - 2.00 p.m. **Lunch and coffee**

2.00 - 3.00 p.m. **Section I: Gender and the Labour Market**
Introduction by Ruth Emerek & Bodil Bjerring: *Danish/Nordic Research on Gender and the Labour Market: Status and Visions*

3.00 - 6.00 p.m. **Short presentation of participants' papers in section I**
Discussion of main problems and key concepts
Chair: Drude Dahlerup
Marianne Rostgård: *The Creation of a Gendered Division of Labour in the Danish Textile Industry*
Iris Rittenhofer: *Leadership in a Genderhistorical Perspective*
Yvonne Due Billing: *Gender and Organization: Towards a Differentiated Understanding*
Eileen Drew: *The Part-Time Option? Women and Part-Time Work in the European Community*
Bodil Bjerring: *Women's Industrial Work in North Jutland*
Ruth Emerek: *On the Subject of Measuring Women's (and Men's) Participation in the Labour Market - An Attempt to categorize and examine Wage Earners Participation in the Labour Market*

6.00 - 8.00 p.m. **Dinner**

8.00 - 9.30 p.m. **Ph.D. programmes in England, Ireland and Sweden**
Introduction by Sylvia Walby, Eileen Drew & Yvonne Hirdman

Monday, August 16

9.00 - 10.45 a.m. **Jane Lewis**: *Gender and Social Policy in Europe: Work, the Family, and the State*
10.45 - 11.00 a.m. **Coffee break**
11.00 - 12.00 a.m. **Section II: Gender, Welfare, and the Family**
Introduction by Maren Bak: *Danish/Nordic Research on Gender, Welfare and the Family: Status and Visions*

12.00 - 1.00 p.m. **Section III: Gender, Power, and Democratic Citizenship**
Introduction by Birte Siim: *Danish/Nordic Research on Gender, Power, and Democratic Citizenship: Status and Visions*

1.00 - 3.00 p.m. **Lunch and coffee**

3.00 - 6.00 p.m. **Short presentation of participants' papers in section II & III**
Discussion of main problems and key concepts
Chair: Karen Sjørup
Ulla Koch: *Studying Care in Modern Economies - Considerations on Methods and Theory Building*
Drude Dahlerup: *Learning to Live with the State. State, Market and Civic Society: Women's Need for State Intervention in East and West*
Anette Aunbirk: *Negotiating Parental Leave*
Maren Bak: *Family Research and Theory in Denmark: A Literature Review*
Birte Siim: *Gender, Power and, Democratic Citizenship*
Ann-Dorte Christensen: *Gender, Mobilization, and Empowerment*

7.30 - **Dinner**

Tuesday, August 17

9.00 - 10.45 a.m. **Yvonne Hirdman**: *Gender Systems and the Nordic Welfare States*
10.45 - 11.00 a.m. **Coffee break**
11.00 - 12.00 a.m. **Section IV: Gender Theory and Feminist Research**
Introduction by Anna-Birte Ravn & Susanne Thorbek: *Danish/Nordic Research on Gender Theory: Status and Visions*

12.00 - 2.00 p.m. **Lunch and coffee**

2.00 - 4.00 p.m. **Short presentation of participants' papers in section IV**
Discussion of main problems and key concepts
Chair: Birte Siim
Karen Sjørup: *Patriarchy and the Female Subject*
Hanne Marlene Dahl: *Contemporary Theories of Patriarchy - Like a Bird Without Wings? Power, Signification and Gender in the Reproduction of Patriarchy*
Lene Gregersen: *Moving far beyond the Separated Fields of Patriarchal Scholarship; the Qualitative Leap of Philosophical Daring*
Susanne Thorbek: *Gender in two Slum Cultures*
Anna-Birte Ravn: *Equality versus Difference and Gender versus Class in Danish Women's History*

4.00 - 5.00 p.m. **General conclusions on the contents of Ph.D. programmes in social science gender studies**
Chair: Ruth Emerek, Ulla Koch, Anna-Birte Ravn and Birte Siim

Wednesday, August 18

9.00 - 12.00 a.m. Meeting on future national and international cooperation on Ph.D. programmes in social science gender studies

Conference papers published elsewhere:

Sylvia Walby: 'Gender, Work and Post-Fordism: the EC Context'. To appear in the **International Journal of Sociology**. Reprinted in Thomas Boye (ed.): **A Changing Europe: Trends in Welfare State and Labour Market**. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Yvonne Hirdmann: **Women - from Possibility to Problem? Gender Conflict in the Welfare State - the Swedish Model**. Research Report No. 3, 1994, Stockholm:Arbetslivscentrum.

Marianne Rostgård: 'The Creation of a Gendered Division of Labour in the Danish Textile Industry'. In Gertjan de Groot & Marlou Schrover (eds.): **Women Workers and Technological Change in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Europe**. The Falmer Press (UK), 1994.

Yvonne Due Billing & Mats Alvesson: 'Gender and Organization: Towards a Differentiated Understanding'. **Organization Studies** 13/12 1992, 73-102.

Eileen Drew: 'The Part-Time Option? Women and Part-Time Work in the European Community'. **Women's Studies International Forum**, Vol. 15, Nos. 5/6, 1992, 607-614.

Bodil Bjerring: 'Kvinder på fabriksarbejde i Nordjylland'. In Esther Fihl & Jens Pinholt: **Livsformer og kultur**. Århus: Akademisk Forlag 1992.

Drude Dahlerup: 'Learning to Live with the State - State, Market, and Civil Society: Women's Need for State Intervention in East and West'. **Women's Studies International Forum**, Vol. 17, Nos. 2/3, 1994, 117-127.

Anette Aunbirk: 'Forhandling om forældreorlov'. **Dansk Sociologi** nr. 3. 1993, 56-72.

Susanne Thorbek: 'Gender in Two Slum Cultures'. In Signe Arnfred et al. (eds.): **The Language of Development Studies**. Copenhagen 1990. And in **Environment and Urbanization**, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1991.

Anna-Birte Ravn: 'Equality versus Difference and Gender versus Class in Danish Women's History'. To appear in **NORA - Nordic Journal of Women's Studies**, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1995.

Publications in FREIA's paper series:

1. Karin Widerberg: Udfordringer til kvinneforskningen i 1990'erne - föredrag på Center for Kvinneforskning i Aalborg 10.5.90, 1992.

2. Feminist Research. Aalborg University. Report 1976-1991, 1992.

3. Ann-Dorte Christensen: Kvinder i den nye fredsbevægelse i Danmark - mellem køkkenruller, resolutioner og teltpæle, 1992.

4. Ulla Koch: Uformel økonomi og social arbejdsdeling - en fortælling om tværfaglighed og det umuliges kunst, 1992.

5. Marianne Rostgaard: Kvindearbejde og kønsarbejdsdeling i tekstilindustrien i Danmark ca. 1830 - 1915, 1992.

6. Inger Agger: Køn og krænkelse - om politisk vold mod kvinder, 1992.

7. Margrethe Holm Andersen: Heks, hore eller heltinde? - et case-studie om tanzanianske kvinders politiske deltagelse og kønsideologier i forandring, 1993.

8. Ulla Koch: A Feminist Political Economics of Integration in the European Community - an outline, 1993.

9. Susanne Thorbek: Urbanization, Slum Culture, Gender Struggle and Women's Identity, 1993.

10. Susanne Thorbek: Køn og Urbanisering, 1994.

11. Poul Knopp Damkjær: Kvinder & rektorstillinger - et indlæg i ligestillingsdebatten, 1994.

12. Birte Siim: Det kønnede demokrati - kvinders medborgerskab i de skandinaviske velfærdsstater, 1994.

13. Anna-Birte Ravn: Kønsarbejdsdeling - diskurs og magt, 1994.

14. Bente Rosenbeck: Med kønnet tilbage til den politiske historie, 1994.

15. Jytte Bang og Susanne Stubgaard: Piger og fysik i gymnasiet, 1994.

16. Harriet Bjerrum Nielsen og Monica Rudberg: Jenter og gutter i forandring, 1994.

17. Jane Lewis: Gender, Family and the Study of Welfare 'Regimes', 1995.

18. Iris Rittenhofer: A Roll in the Hay with the Director: The Manager in a Genderhistorical Perspective, 1995.

19. Ruth Emerek: On the Subject of Measuring Women's (and Men's) Participation in the Labour Market, 1995.

20. Maren Bak: Family Research and Theory in Denmark: A Literature Review, 1995.

21. Ann-Dorte Christensen & Birte Siim: Gender, Citizenship and Political Mobilization, 1995.

22. Hanne Marlene Dahl: Contemporary Theories of Patriarchy - Like a Bird without Wings? Power, Signification and Gender in the Reproduction of Patriarchy, 1995.

23. Lene Gregersen: Moving far beyond the Separated Fields of Patriarchal Scholarship: the Qualitative Leap of Philosophical Daring, 1995.

24. Ulla Koch: Omsorgsbegrebet i lyset af international økonomisk integration - begrebs- og metodediskussion, 1995.

25. Karen Sjørup: Patriarkatet og det kvindelige subjekt, 1995

FREIA - the Feminist Research Centre in Aalborg is an interdisciplinary organization of feminist researchers at Aalborg University. Focus of the centre lies within the social sciences, especially the fields of anthropology, history, sociology/social science, political science, economics and development studies. The present research programme "Gender relations - power, identity and social change" forms the framework of a number of individual and collective projects. FREIA is part of the Department of Development and Planning at Aalborg University.